DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 696 SP 028 482

AUTHOR Ham, Maryellen C.; Oja, Sharon Nodie
TITLE A Collaborative Approach to Leadership in Supervision.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 14 Feb 87
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Arlington, VA, February 12-15, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Action Research; *Administrator Role; *Cooperating Teachers; Developmental Stages; Elementary Secondary Education; *Supervisory Training; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *University of New Hampshire

ABSTRACT

This project demonstrates a collaborative process designed to address the continuing preparation of principals who have primary responsibility for supervising and evaluating teachers, and the preparation of cooperating teachers as more effective supervisors of student teachers. The project focuses on one major question: What is the role of collaborative action research in providing public school principals and teachers with support and challenge for both individual and organizational development and improved supervisory practice? The project includes three phases over a 3-year period: (1) five elementary and two middle school principals participated in a Collaborative Leadership Group (along with project staff members, they facilitated the formation of Collaborative Teacher Supervision Groups); (2) both principals and teachers are applying cognitive-developmental theory to current supervisory practices; and (3) the Principal Leadership Group and the Teacher Supervision Groups will match supervisee developmental stages with appropriate models of supervision and will disseminate their findings. The long-range value of this inquiry is three-fold: (1) to generate implications and further questions for the design and implementation of more effective supervision strategies; (2) to enhance teacher effectiveness and student learning through improved supervisory practices; and (3) to contribute to the development of a theoretical base for the practice of instructional supervision. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277696

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DURHAM, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03824

Collaborative Action Research Projects
Department of Education
College of Liberal Arts
Morrill Hall

A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

Presentation to AACTE
Washington, DC
14 February 1987

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. N. Oja

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Maryellen C. Ham, Project Director
Learning Center Director and Teacher Consultant, SAU #56

Sharon Nodie Oja, Principal Investigator
Associate Professor of Education, UNH

A project funded by the U. S. Department of Education
OERI
Office for Educational Research and Improvement
October, 1985 to September, 1988

SP028 482

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This project demonstrates a collaborative process designed to address 1) the continuing preparation of principals who have primary responsibility for supervising and evaluating teachers as part of their role as instructional leaders in the school and 2) the preparation of cooperating teachers as more effective supervisors of student teaching interns.

In this context, the Project focuses on one major question: What is the role of collaborative action research in providing public school principals and teachers with support and challenge for both individual/organizational development and improved supervisory practice?

Since one criticism of teacher education programs is the absence of a significant theoretical base (Shutes, 1975, Ryan, 1979, and Haberman, 1982), it is important to underscore the cognitive developmental focus of this study. According to many research studies (Shulman and Lanier, 1977; Tikunoff and Ward, 1979; Thies-Sprinthall, 1981; Grimmet, 1983; Oja and Pine, 1984; and Ham, 1985) developmental stage appears to affect how educators identify problems, conceptualize solutions, develop programs, and implement solutions. This project, therefore, reflects:

-previous studies in adult developmental stages
-current research in alternative supervisory models
-collaborative action research as a methodology for collecting data and a strategy for promoting growth.

The Project includes three phases over a three year period. In Phase One, five elementary and two middle school principals participated in a Collaborative Leadership Group. Along with project staff members, they facilitated the formation of Collaborative Teacher Supervision Groups. In Phase Two, both principals and teachers are applying cognitive-developmental theory to current supervisory practices. In Phase Three, the Principal Leadership Group and the Teacher Supervision Groups will match supervisee developmental stages with appropriate models of supervision and will disseminate their findings.

The immediate significance and value of this project includes both its demonstrated refinement of the supervisory skills of elementary school principals and teachers in the proposed school district, and its impact in promoting the personal development of these educators. The long range value of this inquiry, however, is three-fold: (1) to generate implications and further questions for the design and implementation of more effective supervision strategies; (2) to enhance teacher effectiveness and student learning through improved supervisory practices; and (3) to contribute to the development of a theoretical base for the practice of instructional supervision.

INTRODUCTION

This introduction will include references to the theoretical framework and research base for the current study on leadership in supervision, providing links to specifics of the University of New Hampshire teacher education program, current practices in intern supervision, and the emphasis in a local school district on teacher supervision.

For many decades, teacher education has followed traditional models. Training typically consists of four years of college with a brief period of student teaching, with periodic assessments based upon limited observations and often inconsistent goals. Recently, with increased attention focused on the quality of teacher education, conventional models are being questioned. In response, a number of states and universities are establishing innovative programs.

Background History of the UNH Teacher Education Program - Restructuring Teacher Education

The introduction begins with a short description of 10 years of the University of New Hampshire's success in an extended five year teacher preparation program which many other schools are just beginning.

In the recent report of the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education "A Call for Change in Teacher Education" (1985), the University of New Hampshire was one of two institutions cited as models of individual institutions and states which have made significant improvements in their teacher education programs. As cited in that report: " The University of New Hampshire has had a selective, five-year teacher education program since 1975, with the following results: 40% of those accepted have been honor graduates; undergraduate grades average 3.1 (B) on a 4.0 scale; Graduate Examination Scores of those admitted to the final phase of the program averaged 1042. The top three reasons for entering the five-year program were helping in human growth, enjoyment of children, and love of subject. 90% of those completing the program have secured teaching jobs."

The process of change in the Teacher Education Program at the University of New Hampshire began in 1969 and is documented in the invited paper written by Michael D. Andrew, UNH Director of Teacher Education, for delivery to the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education in October, 1984. In that paper he emphasizes that TEACHER LEADERSHIP appears as one of the central objectives in the development of the Five Year Program at the University of New Hampshire. Specifically, the program emphasizes that teachers should be expected to play a major role in the preservice instruction of teachers, to assist with continued growth of inservice teachers, and to take the initiative in curriculum change.

The following paragraphs briefly describe the three phases of the UNH Teacher Education Program and the role played by classroom teachers.

In Phase One: **EXPLORING TEACHING**, classroom teachers have always had a great responsibility in helping undergraduate students, mostly in their sophomore year, to explore teaching and to decide whether teaching is a realistic career choice.

Phase Two: **PROFESSIONAL COURSEWORK** normally begins in the junior year and requires a minimum of four credits to be completed in each of four areas of study: Educational Structure and Change, Human Development and Learning, Alternative Teaching Models, and Alternative Perspectives on the Nature of Education. In order to apply for the teacher education program each student must have a Bachelor's degree.

Phase Three: **POST-BA INTERNSHIP AND GRADUATE STUDIES** is the final phase of the program and consists of a year-long post-baccalaureate internship as well as graduate study related to one's chosen area or level of teaching.

It is Phase Three, and the internship specifically, which the Teacher Education Committee prioritized for immediate investigation to further give classroom teachers more responsibility and leadership in the preparation of teachers. During the 84-85 year, the Teacher Education Committee discussed the issue of intern supervision and the desire for greater university-school collaboration in the supervisory leadership phases of the teacher preparation program. This OERI Project is one of the results of the faculty's concentration on improving the experiences available for cooperating teachers to become better supervisors.

Background History of School Administrative Union #56 - the school district to collaborate with the University in this Project

In recruiting participants for Phase I of this Project, all of the elementary principals from SAU # 56 were invited to participate in a Collaborative Leadership Group to investigate supervisory models. This decision to focus in SAU #56 allowed both university and public school staff to focus upon the common goals and philosophy of a single school district. Because of this district's proximity to the UNH campus and because its Superintendent strongly supports school-university collaboration and views teacher supervision as a prime concern, the decision to focus in this school district also enhances the Project's likelihood for success.

Central office administrators in SAU #56 deal with three separate school boards, Somersworth, Oyster River (includes towns of Durham, Lee and Madbury), and Rollinsford. The city of Somersworth is basically a working class, blue collar community. It has three elementary schools, a middle school and a high school. The towns of Durham, Lee and Madbury include the University of New Hampshire facilities and most University faculty. In addition, these towns are bedroom communities with high percentages of working professionals. Each town has its own elementary school, but they do share the middle school and the high school.The town of Rollinsford has just one school, grades one to six. People in this town are mostly blue

collar workers and farmers, although the population currently is in a state of flux due to recent closings of a major mill and shoe factory.

Implementing a process of differentiated supervision was a specific goal identified by Superintendent John Powers for SAU #56 during the 84-85 school year. To this end, all principals had participated in group discussions of alternative approaches to supervision and all are familiar with the most ASCD publication Differentiated Supervision by Allan A. Glatthorn (1984). Access to this book and other relevant resources, such as the ASCD videotape entitled "The Supervisory Process: Helping Teachers to Improve Instruction," illustrate the SAU #56 districtwide focus on the importance of providing alternative approaches to supervision.

FOCUS OF THIS PROJECT

In developing a theoretical and research based framework for this project, three separate areas of research and practice were reviewed: adult development, collaborative action research, and instructional supervision. The relationships found in this review are summarized below.

1. Educators can use collaborative action research (also called interactive R & D) to grow personally and professionally, developing skills and competencies which will empower them to solve problems and improve educational practice.

References: Tikunoff, Ward, and Griffin (1979); Little (1981); Hord (1981); Huling (1981); Griffin, Lieberman, and Jacullo-Noto (1983); Oja and Pine (1983); Ham (1983); Oja and Ham (1984); and Ham (1985).

2. Schools are the best laboratories for educational research; the integration of research and practice through collaborative action research can contribute to the development of schools as centers of inquiry.

References: Schaefer (1967); Pine (1981); Wallat, et al. (1981); Mergendoller (1981); and above references.

3. Given an appropriate process, participant motivation, and time, it is possible to promote the cognitive growth and psychological development of educators through effective in-service programs.

References: Oja (1978, 1980); McLaughlin and Marsh (1978); Little (1981); Huling (1982); Bents and Howey (1981).

4. Educators who function at higher cognitive developmental stages are more flexible, stress tolerant, adaptive, and generally more effective in their roles.

References: Harvey (1966); Hunt and Joyce (1967); Silver (1973); Glassberg (1979); Oja (1978); Witherell (1978);

Thies-Sprinthall (1981); Thies-Sprinthall and Sprinthall (1983); Oja and Pine (1983).

5. The practice of educational supervision presently lacks a solid theoretical and research based framework.

References: Shutes (1975); Lortie (1977); Ryan (1979); Alfonso and Goldsberry (1982); Haberman (1982); Lovell and Wiles, 1983); Alfonso, Firth and Neville (1984).

6. Effective supervision is dependent upon the consistency between one's espoused and practiced value systems or theories.

References: Argyris and Schon (1974); Argyris (1976, 1982); McNergney and Carrier (1981); Glickman (1981).

7. Like teaching, instructional supervision is a highly complex task. It involves a broad base of knowledge regarding alternative supervisory models, as well as effective strategies for matching teacher needs to specific models.

References: Blumberg (1980); Glickman (1981); Grimsley and Bruce (1982); Sergiovanni (1982, 1984); Grimmet (1983); Thies-Sprinthall and Sprinthall (1983); Cooper (1984); Glatthorn (1984).

8. Instructional supervision is recognized as one of the responsibilities of an effective principal. A variety of styles can be effective, but it is the match which is deemed most important. Rather than seeking a prescription for effective principal behavior, research needs to clarify how different styles and personalities interact with specific contexts and individuals.

References: Blumberg and Greenfield (1980); Sizer (1983); DeBoise (1984); and Ham (1985).

This project is specifically based on a collaborative supervision model with both university and school participation. The research base comes from the Principal Investigator's work in collaborative research strategies with teachers on-site in the schools (Oja and Pine, 1984) and the Project Director's extension of the collaborative research model to principals investigating and experimenting with various supervision strategies (Ham, 1985). In addition, adult development and teacher development theories suggest different supervision strategies are more appropriate for different teachers. These prior research studies dealing with collaborative action research with teachers, collaborative action research with principals, and collaborative research in relation to adult cognitive development are summarized below.

Collaborative Action Research with teachers

Oja recently completed a collaborative action research study working with two groups of middle school teachers (Oja and Pine, 1984). The Project was called Action Research on Change in Schools (ARCS). ARCS was the third in a series of NIE sponsored research activities on collaborative action research.

In the ARCS project, collaborative action research was characterized by several elements:
1. Research problems are mutually defined by teachers and researchers.
2. University researchers and teachers collaborate in seeking solutions to school-based problems.
3. Research findings are used and modified in solving school problems.
4. Teachers develop research competencies and researchers re-educate themselves in field based research methodologies.
5. Teachers are more able to solve their own problems and renew themselves professionally.
6. Teachers and researchers co-author reports of findings.

Although previous studies had involved both teachers and university researchers in collaborative action research, the ARCS project was unique in its reference to stages of adult development. A major implication of the ARCS study for staff development and educational change emanates from the finding that there is a powerful relationship between a teacher's developmental stage and how the teacher participates in and performs on the tasks of collaborative action research.

Collaborative Action Research with Principals

Ham (1985) recently completed a collaborative action research study which focused on deliberately refining the supervisory skills of five public school principals, while also promoting their personal development. These administrators report favorably on both the collaborative process and the positive reactions of teachers to exploring the following alternative approaches to supervision and evaluation.

Clinical Supervision (Goldhammer, 1980)
Peer or Collegial Supervision (Lovell, 1983; Brophy, 1979)
Scientific Supervision (Hunter, 1980)
Human Resources Supervision (Sergiovanni, 1975)
Developmental Supervision (Glickman, 1981)
Differentiated Supervision (Glatthorn, 1984)

Analysis of the results of this study reveals that there is not one "best" supervisory model. Rather, the most effective supervisors appear to be those who can match appropriate supervisory models to the specific needs and developmental levels of their teachers. This conclusion supports the need for public school personnel to investigate, demonstrate, and implement a variety of supervisory models within a specific school and district. In this context, school-university collaboration has the potential to significantly impact both the effectiveness of present classroom

teachers, and the quality of preservice teacher education programs.

Supervision and Adult Cognitive Development

The basic assumption in cognitive developmental stage theory is that people behave according to the level of complexity of their thinking capabilities. Those at less complex levels tend to exhibit rigid, concrete and less adaptive behavior in problem solving situations. Research studies support that the opposite is the case for people who process experience at more complex levels. According to Hunt (1975) the need for flexibility is crucial in choosing how to organize instruction and respond to individual needs.

Since learning to supervise an intern could provide a major opportunity for more complex roletaking by a cooperating teacher, learning that task of supervision is one of the primary objectives of this Proposal. In addition, this Project provides school principals with the opportunity to enhance their repertoire of alternative models of supervision while enabling them to promote both their own cognitive development and that of the teachers with whom they work.

Research on human learning from birth to adulthood has always supported the need for adapting instruction according to the individual characteristics of the learner. The classical works of Piaget (1955) and Bruner (1960) are credited with ushering in the modern "individualization of instruction" movement almost thirty years ago. The natural extension of looking at learning in children has been to study adult learning patterns. The pioneer longitudinal study of teachers by Fuller (1969) suggests that over time teachers' concerns about their work and profession change, and that teacher development parallels adult development.

In the context of educational supervision, the ability to clarify instructional problems, to determine alternative solutions, and to plan new courses of action all demand abstract thinking. Therefore, it appears that educators who possess such problem solving skills, and who can judge the consequences of alternative actions, are more effective in meeting the needs of individuals. Likewise, research suggests that educators who have not developed such abstract thinking ability are limited in discovering alternative solutions or in defining new courses of action.

Kohlberg and Turiel (1971) have documented a troubling aspect involved in fostering abstract thinking. According to their research, the stimulus for helping people move into higher stages of abstract reasoning comes primarily from the interaction with others who are functioning at more advanced stages. The assumption is at more advanced stages, people can promote the conditions, set the environment, offer the support, and provide the probing questions or ideas to stimulate and challenge the thinking of those at lower stages. Yet, in research documenting the moral reasoning stages of adults, Kohlberg (1971) found that only ten perent of teachers scored higher than stage four. If Kohlberg is correct, as Wilkins (1980) poses, how can students learn to reason in higher stages than their teachers? Similarly, the alarming statistics of Harvey (1970) on the

conceptual attainment among preservice and inservice teachers revealed that the percentage of persons in the highest levels of abstract thinking dropped from seven to four percent as their experience in professional education increased. In other words, the higher abstract thinkers either left teaching or regressed to lower cognitive stages, while those at lower levels did not increase their abstract thinking ability.

With the exception of one descriptive study measuring the conceptual ability of elementary schools principals (Silver, 1973), prior research studies on developmental stage theory have not focused on practicing public school administrators. Ham's pilot study (1983) and dissertation study (1984-85) broke ground in this area with administrators. While numerous collaborative action research studies have involved classroom teachers, only a few of these studies included administrators as participants on the school-based teams. Although several researchers, including Sprinthall, Joyce, Thies-Sprinthall, Grimmet, Glickman, and McNergney, have conducted studies involving supervisors, their research has focused on the roles of supervisors in pre-service or beginning teacher education programs. Ham's two studies were unique in their focus, content, and process of supervision practices with administrators.

Ham's studies are reviewed here because they form the research model of work with public school principals, which is basic to the project study. A pilot study on the process of collaborative action research was conducted by Ham in the spring of 1983. The group consisted of three secondary classroom teachers, two administrators, and the researcher, Ham (who was then an instructional supervisor working within the same school). The study revealed the impact of collaborative action research as both a process for linking theory and practice, and a vehicle for stimulating personal cognitive development. Analysis of the results of the pilot study indicated: 1) qualitative differences exist in the developmental stages of adult educators; 2) group interaction and collaboration initiate cognitive development; and 3) open communication and supportive, collegial relationships act as deliberate psychological interventions promoting individual learning.

Ham's second study (1986) focused on the need for public school administrators to be aware of recent research on the cognitive development of adults and the implications of this research for the practice of supervision. A research question was: What is the role of collaborative action research in providing administrators with support and challenge for both individual development and improved supervisory practice? Within the context of a collaborative research group, five principals, unknown to each other and from different school districts, explored alternative ways to: 1) challenge teachers who demonstrated high abstract thinking to develop and refine their skills, and to remain in the education profession; 2) stimulate and support other teachers to acquire and practice abstract thinking skills; and 3) develop personal plans of action for refining their own levels of cognitive development. Her study supported the findings of previous developmental studies (Thies-Sprinthall, 1981; Grimmet, 1983; and Oja and Pine, 1984) showing that developmental stage appeared to affect how educators identify

problems, conceptualize solutions, develop programs, and implement innovations. The study also reflected the dual role of collaborative action research as a method for collecting data as well as a strategy for promoting individual learning and organizational growth.

Critical Aspects of the Project

This collaborative project provides substantial changes from the existing intern student teaching supervision practices at UNH and in the country at large. It also provides substantial changes in the variety of teacher supervision/evaluation systems in practice among most of our school principals.

This project involves many people in the UNH teacher education program and faculty in supervision in SAU #56. It also involves an entire school district working with UNH graduate teaching interns and undergraduate exploring teachers. It could make a significant educational impact in school-university collaboration and pave the way for other schools which want to enhance the role of the cooperating teachers and for principals who wish to investigate alternative supervision strategies. In addition to administrator staff development, the proposed project also provides job enrichment for classroom teachers.

This project addresses 1) the preparation of cooperating teachers as supervisors during the internship year of the preservice education of teachers in an MAT/MED 5 year program and 2) the continuing preparation of principals/administrators who have primary responsibility for supervising and evaluating teachers as part of their role as instructional leaders in the school.

This project has the endorsement and approval of key administrators and university staff responsible for management of teacher education. It also has the endorsement of the SAU #56 Superintendent, principals, and teachers.

The project involves the UNH Education Department and the elementary schools in SAU #56 in which graduate interns and undergraduate students work in their field placements. Project planning and activities include representatives from both UNH and the local schools; this includes faculty and school practitioners. In addition, during the project, the directors will develop possible linkages with relevant institutions from among the OERI sponsored projects and the network of regional labs and national centers.

The project uses collaborative action research as a methodology for collecting data on supervisory practices. The Project Director being situated in the school system, has the opportunity to: assess the climate of the schools; observe the interface between the project and the school; and ask teachers, principals, and Superintendent to reflect on the impact of the project on the participants and schools at various stages. Likewise, the Principal Investigator, being situated at the university, has the same opportunity to get reactions from university supervisors and other faculty at various stages of the project.

PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

An outline of the theoretical framework and project overview is found in Table I. The Theoretical framework consists of the content : theories of adult development and alternative models of supervision and the process: collaborative action research.

(Insert Figure 1)

The Project consists of three phases: development, demonstration, and dissemination over a three year period. These are described below.

PHASE I - Development of Principal Leadership Group (10-85 to 6-86)

GOAL: Investigation of adult development stages and discussion of alternative models of supervision.

OBJECTIVES FOR PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP GROUP
1. Demonstrate the process of collaborative research as one means of promoting personal and organizational development.
2. Brainstorm the possibilities for improving supervisory practices through public school-university collaboration.
3. Share information regarding adult developmental theory (cognitive, ego, moral judgement, conceptual and interpersonal) and major research studies on collaborative action research in schools.
4. Discuss and investigate various models of supervision (clinical, peer, group, scientific, developmental, differentiated, etc.).
5. Define role of school leadership participants in Phase II of this Project (Initiation of Classroom Teacher Supervision Groups).

During Phase 1 of the project, five elementary and two middle school principals met regularly with the principal investigator and project director to explore/apply issues in adult development, alternative supervisor models or strategies, and the unique characteristics of the collaborative action research process. Principals in the Principal Leadership Group (PLG) also played a major role in helping to structure Teacher Supervision Groups for each school. Three of the principals met regularly with the individual TSGs from January to June, 1986, as teachers explored the project's three focus areas: adult development, supervision, and collaboration.

PHASE I - Development of Teacher Supervision Groups (1-86 to 6-86)

GOAL: Increase the flexibility of selected classroom teachers by examining and demonstrating various models of supervision within the framework of adult cognitive/development stages.

Figure 1

OVERVIEW

A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION
1985-1988

Theoretical Framework

Content: Theories of Adult Development
Alternative Models of Supervision

Process: Collaborative Action Research

Project Overview

Phase 1: Development

Create Principal Leadership Group
Create Teacher Supervision Groups
Introduce Content and Process
Initiate UNH/SAU #56 Task Force on Supervision

Phase 2: Demonstration

Match Teachers and UNH Students
Principals/Teachers Apply Content
Continue CAR Process
Develop Two Models for CTI (Cooperating Teacher/Intern) Supervision
Initiate Cooperating Teacher/Intern Supervision Position

Phase 3: Dissemination

Continue CAR Process and Content Applications
Disseminate Findings Regionally and Nationally
Institutionalize Effective Practices
Extend Model to Secondary Schools

OBJECTIVES FOR TEACHER SUPERVISION GROUPS
The first four objectives below reflect the introduction to the collaborative action research methods and the models of supervision. The principals from the Leadership Group in Phase I continued to be involved here to add their knowledge, experience, and support to the Teacher Supervision Groups.
1. Demonstrate the process of collaborative action research.
2. Brainstorm the possibilities for improving supervisory practices through public school-university collaboration.
3. Share information on adult developmental theory (cognitive, ego, moral judgement, conceptual, and interpersonal) and major research studies on collaborative action research with teachers and schools.
4. Discuss and investigate various models of supervision (clinical, peer, group, scientific, developmental, differentiated, etc.)
5. Structure Teacher Supervision Group meetings to include five conditions needed to promote developmental growth: 1) significant role-taking, 2) guided reflection, 3) balance of experience and discussion/reflection, 4) support and challenge, and 5) continuity-time. (Theis-Sprinthall, 1979). Also include the four staff development training components researched by Joyce (1980): 1) describe model; 2) demonstrate model; 3) plan and peer teach model; 4) adopt/generalize model.
6. Improve/Refine the behavioral skills of teachers acting in the complex role of supervisors.

Teachers and principals in each school collaboratively decided the most appropriate way for them to function together. In this phase, the TSGs collaboratively focused on theories of adult development, collaborative action research processes, and supervision practices. Also, the Teacher Supervision Group, Principal Leadership Group, and the UNH staff began to jointly define additional time and task responsibilities for expanding the ways in which they might work with UNH students in several different capacities during the following year.

Over the summer, as a result of the data gathered in the evaluation meetings and questionnaires, the contributions made by the project to individual schools and teachers were assessed and possible ways for restructuring individual and group activities for the following year were generated.

PHASE II - Teacher Supervision and Principal Leadership Groups-Demonstration (9-86 to 6-87)

GOAL: Refine the quality of supervision in a variety of school-based contexts (Internship, Exploring Teaching, peer, and principal/teacher) by applying and demonstrating the developmental framework for supervision explored by the Principal Leadership Group and Teacher Supervision Groups in Phase 1.

OBJECTIVES:
1. Demonstrate the process of collaborative research as one means of promoting personal and organizational development and improved supervisory practice.

2. Facilitate the Cooperating Teachers' initiation of a series of interventions designed to match alternative supervision models to the interns' cognitive developmental levels.
3. Encourage effective Teacher Supervision Group meetings by attention to five conditions for staff development and four training components. See Objective #5 above for restatement.

In Phase 2, both the PLG and TSGs are continuing to meet. The PLG is focusing on matching alternative supervision models to the individual needs of teachers in their schools. A total of forty-six university students were placed in supervisee positions with cooperating teachers in the elementary and middle schools in SAU #56 for the fall semester of the 2nd year of the project (10 were University graduate teaching interns in a 5th year MAT/MED Education program, two were one semester student teachers, 33 were undergraduate level students in an introductory field-based Education course exploring teaching as a career, and one was a graduate MAT student doing research in the classroom). Twenty-one of these cooperating teachers had participated fully in the first year of the training. Four classroom teachers have assumed added responsibilities acting as Course Collaborators meeting regularly as a group with the exploring teaching students in the Somersworth/Rollinsford schools.

A School-University Task Force for improved supervision was formed by representatives of the teachers, principals, University supervision faculty, Director of Field Experiences, and project staff. They discussed the implications of the project relative to the Teacher Education Program and, specifically, the supervision of student interns by classroom teachers. This Task Force assumed responsibility for 1) creating two school-based models for cooperating teacher supervision to start in different schools in the second year and 2) drafting competencies and accompanying behavioral indicators in the areas of adult development, supervision, and collaboration. Two alternative models of supervision resulted, with one group of teachers (Durham) to experiment with an egalitarian model of cooperating teacher supervision and another group of teachers (Somersworth) choosing a differentiated staffing model. The responsibilities initially defined by the Task Force for each model are attached in Figure 2.

(Insert Figure 2)

PHASE 3 - TEACHER SUPERVISION GROUPS - (9-87 TO 6-88)
DEMONSTRATION AND DISSEMINATION

Goal: Continue the Collaborative Principal Leadership and Teacher Supervision Groups focusing on demonstration and application of the supervision models and the matching of these models to developmental stages. Additionally, the activities of these groups will be based on new learnings from the reflection and analysis of their work during Year 2, Phase 2.

The third year of the project will continue with the collaborative group

Figure 2

SUPERVISION MODELS

In the differentiated staffing model one teacher is designated as a "cooperating teacher/supervisor" taking on significant supervision responsibilities with cooperating teachers and interns in the school building. In the egalitarian staffing model all cooperating teachers as a group in one building take on some expanded supervision responsibilities.

DIFFERENTIATED (CTS)	EGALITARIAN (Joint CT Group)
1. Supervise own intern, and do some supervision as requested by others (CTs, interns, principal, UNH supervisor).	1. Supervise own intern.
2. Meet individually and jointly with other CTs on regular basis.	2. Meet jointly with other CTs on regular basis, and occasionally with interns.
3. Meet individually and jointly with all interns on a regular basis and facilitate peer observations.	3. All CTs and interns plan mutual observations on a regular basis.
4. Use video and audio tapes to enhance supervision of all interns and increase communication among CTs.	4. Use audio and video tapes with own intern.
5. Negotiate with UNH supervisor re: shared role responsibilities.	5. Attend one or two intern seminars per year.
6. Attend intern seminars and jointly plan these with UNH supervisor.	6. CT representatives meet occasionally with UNH Supe Group.
7. Perform liaison functions between UNH and CT/interns.	
8. Locate people and material resources for teachers and interns.	
9. Meet with other CTs and occasionally with the UNH Supe Group.	
10. Act as a resource within school and district on issues of supervision and joint UNH/school projects.	

meeting format and allow evaluation of : 1) teachers' success in matching alternative supervision strategies to new graduate student teacher interns; 2) principals' success in matching alternative supervision strategies to their school's teachers; and 3) the collaborative process among principals, terachers, interns, university supervisors, and project staff. The evidence will help the UNH Teacher Education Program and the School-University Task Force on Improved Supervision to make decisions regarding institutionalization of the developed practices at the elementary school level and extending the model to the secondary school level.

Data Collection and Analysis of Outcomes

Data collection includes quantitative and qualitative data on the collaborative action research process in the Leadership Group and the Supervision Groups and the effects of the collaborative process on individual participants. The focus of the ethnographic observations is on the sequence of events and interactions among participants in the collaborative action research groups.

To record and monitor the collaborative supervision process in each Group the following data sources are used: 1) audio recordings of selected Group Meetings, 2) minutes and agendas of all Group Meetings, 3) baseline , midpoint, and final interviews with participants, 4) surveys of participants, 5) reflective journals, 6) observation of group meetings and supervisory interactions, as well as 7) three empirical measures of adult cognitive developmental stage.

The Project reports describe:
1. The participants of the Principal Leadership and the Teacher Supervision Groups.
2. The roles, responsibilities and activities undertaken by each participant in the collaborative supervision process.
3. The impact of the collaborative (action) research process on promoting individual and organizational development and supervisory effectiveness.
4. The usefulness of the collaborative reseach findings in relation to the content of alternative models of supervision and adult cognitive developmental stages.
5. The assistance and other types of support requested and or required during the collaborative process.

Investigation focuses on the outcomes for the supervisees, school faculty and principals, higher education supervision faculty, and the programmatic/organizational dimensions which facilitate and support a school-university collaborative supervision process within the framework of the university teacher education program.

REFERENCES

Alfonso, R. & Goldsberry, L (1982). Colleagueship and supervision. In T. Sergiovanni (Ed.), Supervision of Teaching. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Alfonso, Firth, & Neville (1984). The supervisory skill mix. Educational Leadership, 41, 16-18.

Andrew, M. D. (1974). Teacher leadership: A model for change. Washington, DC: Association for Teacher Educators.

Andrew, M. D. (1984). Restructuring teacher education: The University of New Hampshire's five year program. Invited paper for the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire.

Argyris, C. (1976). Increasing leadership effectiveness. New York: John Wiley.

Argyris, C. (1982). Reasoning, learning, and action: Individual and organizational. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Argyris, Chris & Schon, D. (1974). Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. (1980). The effective principal: perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cooper, J. (Ed.) (1984). Developing skills in instructional supervision. New York: Longman.

DeBevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader, Educational Leadership. February

Glassberg, S. (1979). Developmental models of teacher development. ERIC: ED 171-658.

Glatthorn, A. (1984). Differentiated supervision. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, C. (1981). Developmental supervision: Alternative practices for helping teachers improve instruction. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Griffin, G. A., Lieberman, A., & Jacullo-Noto, J. (1983). Interactive research and development on schooling: Executive summary of the final report. University of Texas at Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1983.

Grimmet, P. (1983). Effective clinical supervision conference interventions. Paper presented at AERA Symposium, Montreal, Canada.

Grimsley & Bruce, (Eds.) (1982). Reading in educational supervision. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Haberman, M. (1982). The legacy of teacher education, 1980-2000. Houston, TX: Hunt Lecture at the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Annual Meeting.

Ham, M. (1985). The impact of collaborative action research in promoting the cognitive development and enhancing the supervisory effectiveness of five school administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. George Peabody College of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.

Hord, S. (1981). Working together: Cooperation or collaboration. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Huling, L. L. (1982). The effects on teachers of participation in an interactive research and development project. Unpublished dissertation Texas Tech University (1981) and AERA presentation (1982).

Hunt, D. (1975). Teacher personality, teacher attitude, and teacher behavior: Preferred style and trainability. Toronto, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Hunt, D. E. & Joyce, B. R. (1967). Teacher trainee personality and initial teaching style. American Educational Research Journal, 4, 253-259.

Hunter, M. & Russel, D. (1980). Planning for effective instruction. Los Angeles: University Elementary School.

Joyce, B. & Weil, M. (1980). Models of teaching. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Little, J. W. (1981). School success and staff development. Boulder, CO: Center for Action Research.

Lortie, D. (1977). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lovell, J. & Wiles, K. (1983). Supervision for better schools. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

McLaughlin, M. W. & Marsh, D. D. (1978). Staff development and school change. Teachers College Record, 80(1).

McNergney R. & Carrier C. (1981). Teacher Development. New York: Macmillan.

Mergendoller, J. R. (1981). Mutual inquiry: The role of collaborative research on teaching in school based staff development. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Oja, S. N. (1978). A cognitive-structural approach to adult conceptual, moral, and ego development through inservice teacher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Minnesota.

Oja, S. N. (1980). Adult development in implicit in staff development. The Journal of Staff Development, Vol. 1, No. 2, October.

Oja, S. N. (1983). A two year study of teachers' stages of development in relation to collaborative action research in schools: Final report. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Oja, S. N. & Pine, G. J. (1984). Executive summary: Collaborative action research: A two year study of teachers' stages of development and school contexts. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Pine, G. (1981). Collaborative action research: The integration of research and service. Paper at AACTE, Detroit.

Ryan, K. (1979). Mainstreaming and teacher education: The last straw. In M. Reynolds, (Ed.), A common body of practice for teachers Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Support Systems.

Schaefer, R. J. (1967). The School as a Center of Inquiry. New York: Harper and Row.

Sergiovanni, T. (1982). Toward a theory of supervisory practice: Integrating scientific, clinical, and artistic views. Supervision of Teaching. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Shulman, L. & Lanier, J. (1977). The institute for research on teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 44-49.

Shutes, R. (1975). Needed: A theory of teacher education. Texas-Tech Journal of Teacher Education, 2, 94-101.

Silver, P. (1973). Principals' conceptual ability in relation to situation and behavior. Educational Administration Quarterly, 11, Autumn, 49-66.

Sizer, T. (1983). Personal communication. Education Leadership, ASCD, September.

Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1979). Promoting the conceptual and principled thinking level of the supervising teacher. Research Report. St. Cloud, MN: St. Cloud University.

Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1980). Supervision: An educative or miseducative process? Journal of Teacher Education, 31, 17-20.

Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1981). Educating for teacher growth: A cognitive developmental perspective. Theory Into Practice, 19, 278-286.

Thies-Sprinthall, L. & Sprinthall, N. A. Preservice teacher as adult learners: A new framework for teacher education. In M. Haberman and J. Backus (Eds.), The nature and scope of research in teacher education, 1983.

Tikunoff, B. & Ward, B. (1979). Effective teacher education programs. San Francisco, CA: Far West Regional Laboratory.

Wallat, C. Green, J. L., Conlin, S. M. & Haramis, M. (1981). Issues related to action research in the classroom-the teacher and researcher as a team. In J. J. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), Ethnography and language in educational settings. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Witherell, C. (1978). A structural-developmental analysis of teachers' conceptions of teaching and human development in relation to Patterns of teaching behavior: Five case studies. Unpublished dissertation. University of Minnesota.